

APPROVED MINUTES
TRINITY ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT WORKING GROUP
April 22-23, 2003
Victorian Restaurant - Weaverville, CA

Tuesday April 22, 2003
Meeting open to the public.

9:10 AM Convene
Members present:

Member

Serge Birk
Jeffery Bryant
Edgar Duggan
James Feider
Patrick Frost
Dan Haycox
Dana Hord
Kevin Lewis
Byron Leydecker
Richard Lorenz
Charles Schultz
Elizabeth Soderstrom
David Steinhauser
Arnold Whitridge (Chair)

Representative Seat

Central Valley Project Water Association
American Forest Resource Council
Willow Creek Community Services District
City of Redding Electric Utility Department
Trinity County Resource Conservation District
Miners Alliance
Big Bar Community Development Group
American Whitewater
California Trout, Inc.
Trinity County Resident
Bureau of Land Management
Natural Heritage Institute
Six Rivers Outfitter and Guide Association
Safe Alternatives for Forest Environment

Designated Federal Representative

Mike Long

Field Supervisor of the Arcata Fish and
Wildlife Office, standing in for Mary Ellen
Mueller

Douglas Schleusner, Executive Director of the Trinity River Restoration Program also in attendance.

Members not in attendance: Tim Colvin - Trinity Lake Resort Owners Association, Zeke Grader - Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations, William Huber - South Fork Trinity River CRMP (later joined the meeting after the noon break), Jim Smith - Humboldt County Board of Supervisors (Mr. Smith's alternate, Humboldt County Supervisor Jill Geist, joined the meeting on day two), James Spear – Natural Resource Conservation District

Welcome and introduction

Welcome and Introduction by Chairman Arnold Whitridge

Approved April 22-23 TAMWG meeting minutes.
Recorded by Charlie Chamberlain – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Approval of minutes from February meeting

****Motion** Byron Leydecker made motion to approve the February minutes**

****Second** Serge Birk seconded.**

****Motion passed****

There was general discussion suggesting that the February minutes captured more detail than necessary and that future minutes could be shortened.

Sherri Withiam (public participant and Trinity County Resident) – How do we get to see the minutes? Charlie Chamberlain (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service) – Minutes will be made available at the Trinity Restoration Program office, the Arcata Fish and Wildlife Office, and eventually on the web.

Agenda approval

Agenda approved with minor revision: A discussion of TAMWG emphasis areas planned for tomorrow morning will be introduced at the end of today, and the last item scheduled for today regarding the Trinity County Grant Program will be moved to tomorrow.

(Attachment 1 – Approved Agenda)

Public comment period

Scott McBain (public participant) introduced a proposal to the group seeking its support regarding potential BLM acquisition of the Weigel parcel at Gold Bar as a long-term sediment source for the Restoration Program. Scott is buying the parcel himself to hopefully transfer to the Program for his cost. Scott is asking the Group to review the proposal and make a formal recommendation to the Restoration Program to support the effort.

(Attachment 2 – Gold Bar Proposal)

There were questions and discussion about processing of fines, potential mercury issues, public access, public vs. private ownership, and the short-term vs. long-term cost commitments of the project. Chuck Shultz related that a similar BLM effort with dredger tailings on Clear Creek has been successful.

****Motion** Elizabeth Soderstrom made a motion to put discussion of the Gold Bar proposal on the next meeting agenda. Solicit presentation on detail of BLM involvement, who will manage the property, and discussion of the temporary bridge that may be needed to transport gravel from the site.**

****Second** Richard Lorenz seconded the motion.**

****Motion passed**** Issue will be discussed at the next TAMWG meeting

Doug Schleusner – Schedule of the next TAMWG meeting has tentatively been suggested for June in order to discuss the Program budget. The TAMWG may need to allot sufficient time at that meeting for both the budget and this discussion. Another two-day meeting may be necessary.

Public comment period continued

Jerry Hauke (public participant) stated that a goal of the Lewiston Trail Group is to have a public access trail from Grass Valley Creek to Rush Creek. The Salt Flat bridge document is currently under internal review. This is a pre-decision process. The decision will already be made by the time it is made public. This will be private bridge with no public access. Cost will be one million dollars for a private bridge for Trinity County's first gated community. This is a perfect opportunity for a win-win project with public funds to provide public access along with the bridge. This bridge has already been announced as private at a Humboldt County Board of Supervisors Meeting. There is no legal entity for tax support to maintain the bridge. One million dollars in public funds should result in some gain in public access. Jerry asked the Chairman to call for straw vote to ask for public access.

Pat Frost – Where are we at in public documents regarding the bridge? Ed Solbos of the Trinity River Restoration Program responded that the Draft EIR will be out by the 1st of May. Then there is a public review and comment period. Public access *is* included in one alternative. A NEPA document is a disclosure document, not a decision document. We are aiming to award a construction contract by end of the fiscal year. CEQA requires certification process by Trinity County Board of Supervisors.

Byron Leydecker –The bridge has to be maintained and it seems that there will be associated costs. Ed Solbos– That is recognized. In this climate the design and materials intended to use work well but will require attention for surfacing, approach roads, etc. The proposed action would be for Salt Flat Home Owners Association to be responsible for maintaining the bridge.

Serge Birk – Will preferred alternatives for the bridge sites have public access? Elizabeth Soderstrom – Have you looked into the bridge being privately owned with an agreement for public access? Ed Solbos – Need to include alternatives that folks will want analyzed.

Douglas Schleusner – A couple of comments about process: We really are in the spirit of adaptive management and incorporate public opinion. There is no simple resolution to this issue. It *is* conceivable that a different alternative could be selected. The present alternatives are based on scoping comments that were received about a year ago. A preferred alternative has not been selected.

Arnold Whitridge – To get public access we would have unwilling landowners. It would require taking something away from the Salt Flat Community. Our focus is to restore the river. We have to consider public interest. The Program is attempting to preserve the existing property rights. Providing public access would require breaching some of those private property rights.

Douglas Schleusner – The Record of Decision (ROD) that we are operating under identified the need to modify structures in order to pass the flows. It did not say we had to consider recreational access. The basics here are the need to be able to pass the higher flows. Byron Leydecker – It is also a safety issue. The Bureau of Reclamation needs to be able to pass higher flows for dam safety

****Motion** Pat Frost made a motion to include discussion of the Salt Flat Bridge replacement project on the next agenda.**

****Second** Byron Leydecker seconded.**

****Motion passed** Motion unanimously approved.** Topic will be incorporated into next meeting's agenda.

Draft Strategic Plan

Doug Schleusner presentation on Trinity River Restoration Program Draft Strategic Plan
([Attachment 3 – Strategic Plan PowerPoint presentation](#))
([Attachment 4 – Draft Strategic Plan](#))

- Why we need the plan
- The process
- Planning context
- Statutory Authority
 - ROD
 - Flow Evaluation Report
 - Final EIS/EIR
 - Implementation Plan for preferred alternative
 - Judicial Rulings
- Draft strategic plan Contents
- Mission Statement
- Program Goals
- Next steps – would like the group to review this material by June 18 (next meeting)

Daryl - Development of indicators and then identifying measurable thresholds is critical. Serge Birk – Put descriptive language to the goals and identifiable milestones. Byron Leydecker - This is an enormous step forward for the Program. Development of the Strategic Plan is a professional management processes that make sense. Objectives in private industry are likewise quantitatively stated.

Adaptive Management: General Concepts and Application to the Trinity River with Case Studies

Daryl Peterson –Presentation on general concepts of Adaptive Management and experimentation on the Trinity River
([Attachment 5 – Adaptive Management PowerPoint Presentation](#))

PowerPoint presentation

What is Adaptive Management? It is a formal systematic process

General Steps: Assess, design, implement, monitor, evaluate, adjust, assess

When do you use Adaptive Management? When there is uncertainty of outcome, competing goals, knowledge seeking, repeated actions, need for new ways to accomplish objectives, and a need for flexible management.

Attributes for successful Adaptive Management – Acknowledge uncertainty, involve stakeholders in goal setting, prepare for change, develop explicit conceptual models for the system, focus on driving variables not symptoms, commitment to learning and doing, effective leadership.

Two modes of Adaptive Management:
Refinement Model and Exploratory Model

TAMWG Participation in Adaptive Management process spelled out in ROD
TMAG incorporates input from several outside sources including TAMWG and Technical workgroups

12:00 Break for lunch.

TAMWG Member Bill Huber of the South Fork Trinity River CRMP joined the Group after the lunch break.

Water Year 2003 Release Schedule

Charlie Chamberlain – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service presentation on Dry Year water flows and potential fall pulse-flows to prevent another fish die-off.

(Attachment 6 - ROD Dry Year Flow Schedule and Potential Fall Pulse Flows PowerPoint Presentation)

PowerPoint presentation - Dry Water Year Hydrograph

Water-year hydrographs from the ROD. This year is a Wet year but we have been limited to a dry year water allocation by Federal Judge Wanger

Probabilities of occurrence for each water year type (12% Extremely Dry, 28% Dry, 20% Normal, 28% Wet, 12% Extremely Wet)

Hydrologic and geomorphic objectives of the Dry-year hydrograph

1. Emulates timing and duration of dry year snowmelt hydrograph
2. Mobilizes spawning gravels

Dry year flow water temperature characteristics

1. Marginal temperatures for smolts
2. Encourages early outmigration

Discussion followed regarding the intent of the dry year flow schedule to mimic the natural snowmelt timing and hydrology of a dry year, and whether or not that is appropriate for the wet year we are currently experiencing.

PowerPoint presentation - Potential Fall Pulse Flows

(Attachment 7 – Averting Another Die-Off)

Developed to respond to a request from Federal Judge Oliver Wanger for solutions to avert another lower Klamath River fish die-off. Solution had to be Trinity based.

Assumptions: ICH and columnaris were the primary causes of death and were exacerbated by high water temperatures typical of the lower Klamath in late summer and a relatively large run of fall chinook congregating in the lower Klamath.

Approach: Try to prevent high densities during a critical time period of mid-August to mid-September.

Three scenarios forwarded:

- Scenario 1) Sustained, month-long 1,500 cfs pulse from Lewiston Dam using 69,206 acre-feet of water
- Scenario 2) Four 2,000 cfs pulses using 39,857 acre-feet
- Scenario 3) An adaptable hybrid of the first two scenarios where 2,000 cfs pulsed would be initiated and evaluated for effectiveness at moving and dispersing fish. If successful, periodic pulses would continue through the critical period. If unsuccessful at moving fish, releases would revert back to a 1,500 cfs sustained release at Lewiston Dam for the remainder of the critical period. Scenario 3 uses from 34,805 to 57,976 acre-feet of water, depending on the effectiveness of the initial pulses.

Implementation: A technical group is suggested to assess the situation in July.

Triggering criteria are suggested. If implementation is triggered, the technical group would provide final review of the potential relief strategies and coordinate to monitor the response of fish and environmental conditions

Judge's Order: 50,000 acre-feet was ordered available at BOR's discretion to avert another die-off if the issue is not addressed by management in the Klamath River.

****Motion** Jim Feider made a motion to suggest that dry-year allocation of water be optimized considering current wet year conditions. Make the recommendation directly to TMC.**

****Second** Ed Duggan seconded**

****Discussion****

Arnold Whitridge – Do you have feel for who should be involved in optimization. Jim Feider – No. Hopes are that the staff puts forth a good-faith effort to evaluate the situation. I intend we convey to TMC a desire for optimization by the Restoration Program staff and inclusion of CDFG in the process. Staff should come prepared to present a recommendation to TMC

Serge Birk – Maybe there are alternate flow scenarios that have not been reviewed but may be available. I would like the TMC to see there are some other options. We know what happens with public comments.

Curtis Anderson (public participant from California Department of Water Resources) – California will likely ask for delay of 17 days in hydrograph ramp-up to match natural spring snowmelt hydrology. Doug has said he could get his staff to work on this. Do not discount that there are multiple possible hydrographs and it is not a simple process.

Richard Lorenz – Concerned about short timeline and would defer to Doug's group. Don't add us to the mix for this exercise into determining optimum flow.

Arnold Whitridge - Elements are: We think optimization should occur; we would like the State included in the process; we would like a recommendation regarding flows to be available by the upcoming TMC meeting. Implement whatever measures are appropriate (such as delay of ramp up).

Serge Birk – Add language for future process.

Jim Feider - Maybe suggest that straw-man issues in future be circulated soon as possible

****Motion passed** Motion passed unanimously.**

Douglas Schleusner will make calls to TMC and Arnold will have a draft letter in the morning.

Director's Quarterly Report and Program Updates

Daryl Peterson made Doug Schleusner's presentation on Director's Quarterly report.
(Attachment 8 – Quarterly Report)

Doug left to make phone contact with TMC members regarding flow optimization. In his absence Daryl conducted a quick review of Doug's handout to the Members

An area the TAMWG will want to consider forming a sub-group to address, is in planning for restoration sites downstream of Canyon Creek

Dana Hord – Where is the process on the Hocker Flat restoration site? Daryl Peterson - Draft designs have been circulated. Ed Solbos - Shooting for end of Aug to put out to bid and award a contract by the end of September.

TAMWG Emphasis Areas

Arnold Whitridge - This is an opportunity to chart our course and identify our interests.

Elizabeth Soderstrom - What is the scope of the group? What areas of emphasis do we see within our scope? What are the areas in the next year we want to visit?

Pat Frost – Tributaries. Jim Spear (absent) would like to lead a subgroup to delve into tributary issues.

Arnold Whitridge – Science. I don't see a seamless consensus about science. There are many critics about the science. Would like to open up to a discussion and flesh out areas where science may be disputed and find out where there is agreement or disagreement. One topic is, "Is it important to rehabilitate tributaries?" Try to develop some common understanding.

Byron Leydecker – I see 3-4 principle areas including: Tributaries, Flow schedule, Estuary. The issue is what comprises the ecosystem and what are those elements? We will never get full agreement on the science.

Dana Hord – Are we trying to form a vision statement (from discussion of emphasis areas)?

Arnold Whitridge - Trying to define our effort.

Elizabeth Soderstrom - Adaptive management is a collaborative learning process that we insert into as stakeholders and interact with decision makers. There is no right or wrong, there will always be uncertainty. We just need to have input. The process has been set up to engage us in the process, recognizing the uncertainty

Ed Duggan – What technical information will be made available to us to address technical issues? Arnold Whitridge – The Program should be able to provide technical input. Daryl Peterson – Technical representatives from this group should be available to the program as well. Those technical reps can bring the information back to this group. You also have the ear of the TMC.

Serge Birk - This group should influence policy at the TMC level. We can engage with the Science Advisory Board.

Byron Leydecker – With regard to subcommittees, there are persons not in this group that would be valuable to bring in.

Brian Jobson (public participant from Sacramento Municipal Utilities District) – Geomorph should be an emphasis and avoid the less than successful efforts of the Program in the past. Geomorphology is foundational to this restoration effort at key emphasis areas.

Daryl Peterson – Focus areas in the Program's interest such as restoration site design, flow scheduling, sediment management, and monitoring measures of success.

Brian Jobson (public participant) – You should shed light on problems encountered in the past. SMUD can provide a presentation that addresses some of these issues. Serge Birk – Not just SMUD. There may be a fair amount of other work as well. CVPIA and CALFED have produced many modeling tools that may be useful.

Jack Ellwanger (public participant from Salmon Coalition) – Is it an objective of the group to have a sustainable fishery? Jeff Bryant – How do we know we have accomplished that? We need to know where we want to go. We need a mission statement or goals to map how we get there. Then decide appropriate subcommittees. Some issues may not be as intuitive as flow schedules.

Arnold Whitridge – A comprehensive monitoring framework was mentioned earlier. A list of hypothesis - what are we testing. Seems like an important tool to have in order to grapple with the issues and how we are testing and budgeting. Daryl, you can put together a monitoring framework to identify what you are doing, but you also need measures of success. Those may be more than biological. Daryl – We will likely have a framework product this fall. Byron Leydecker – There are fishery numbers in the ROD that serve as a measure.

Jeff Bryant – We should determine how to set priorities of individual items as they come through the door and determine what to focus on.

Ed Solbos – This is something all the Trinity Programs have talked about since the 70's. We have been having workshops etc. We should have the Science Advisory Board take look at this right from the start. High caliber folks have tried to address this issue and have not come to agreement.

Daryl Peterson– SAB is anticipated to be available to TAMWG, TMC, etc for interaction. Measures of success should include what is important to the group you represent.

Jack Ellwanger (public participant) – Science is nice, but you need objective and principle to shoot for. The Salmon Summit in December heard some astounding numbers about what salmon means economically to Northern California.

Arnold Whitridge – The ROD stated that “the better approach than counting fish was achievement of healthy alluvial attributes.”

Daryl Peterson– There should be multiple metrics to measure success.

Elizabeth Soderstrom For the monitoring question, maybe we should wait for this framework from Daryl.

Serge Birk – Appreciate the candor exhibited here. We do not want to go down the path where we just react to what the Program has already produced. The process needs to be transparent. We must be responsive to the public. In the CALFED example, workshops are used to deal with specific topics that the program needs input on. Workshops help make it public.

Elizabeth Soderstrom –This group as stakeholders is closer to the public than any other body of the program. Would like to see conferences or other venues used to engage the public. The tributary issue would be good for this group to bring up. We need presentations that bring us up to speed, and need presentations to fill the gaps of knowledge, and need to push the envelope.

Curtis Anderson (public participant from California Department of Water Resources) – Curtis mentioned the Adaptive Environmental and Assessment Management (AEAM) conference held a couple of years ago in Arcata. Has this group received results from the conference? Daryl - The program still has not received the final report on that.

Chuck Schultz – Those FACA groups over the years that have been successful are those that have been able to make a difference. Scope and scale are important issues. We cannot accomplish everything. To be most effective we will have to limit our scope. We need to deal on the policy or program-level scale rather than the technical level. This group should be a conduit for public concerns and interests.

Byron Leydecker – I agree that this group should operate on a policy level rather than technical.

Arnold Whitridge – My personal interest is in policy. Plan tomorrow to brainstorm. Tasks tomorrow will be to review a draft letter regarding flow optimization, the Humboldt County

Approved April 22-23 TAMWG meeting minutes.

Recorded by Charlie Chamberlain – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

letter to the Secretary of Interior, and our draft by-laws. We will not be able to adopt by-laws tomorrow but can discuss them.

Adjourn for the day at 4:25

April 23, 2003
Day two

Humboldt County Supervisor Jill Geist is present as an approved alternate for Jim Smith

Reconvened at 8:15

Discuss remaining agenda for morning

Brainstorm emphasis areas

TAMWG By-laws

Humboldt County's letter to the Secretary of Interior regarding Klamath Fishery Flows

Issue of tributary funding

Letter regarding optimization of flow

Schedule next meeting

TAMWG Emphasis Areas – Continued from yesterday

Brainstorming topics by subject group: Around the table to forward Member ideas

Major topics:

- 1. Socio-economics**
- 2. Science**
- 3. Implementation**
- 4. Process (budget, RFP, etc.)**
- 5. Watershed – basin-wide**

Brainstorm ideas were captured and listed below into the five major topic areas with the intent that these could potentially serve as emphasis areas for various subcommittees defined by the major topic.

1. Socioeconomics

- Recreation and multi-use
- Recreation/multi-use related to flows and economic valuation of recreation
- Recreational benefit of restoration – social and economic
- Area of origin water right and putting it to beneficial use
- Design restoration projects to maximize use of local contractors
- Increase economic value to community
- Integration of Tribal culture and economic impacts
- Economic impact to mining from flow schedules. Optimize
- Increase public access to river
- Recreational use of Trinity Lake and lake management
- Private property rights

2. Science

- Fish goal metrics including tributaries
- Planting of fish in tributaries
- Measuring impact
- Fish hatchery's role
- Real science as it relates to dredging impacts
- Mercury issues
- Getting away from single-species management (include amphibians)
- Are fish counts accurate? Monitor the monitorers. Quality control

3. Implementation

- Focus on getting the maximum amount of appropriate funding for projects on ground
- Flow optimization
- Cost effective monitoring

4. Process/Budget

- Return the river to what it was pre-dam, no jungle and fish in the river
- Focus on things that might otherwise fall through the cracks
- Focus primarily on a policy level
- Identify and explore areas where TAMWG members disagree
- Ensure that policy decisions made by TAMWG and TMC are based on credible science
- Comply with all laws related to Trinity River resources
- Direct research to reflect Members interest, resolve Member disagreement
- Annual budget review
- Promote education and outreach
- Inspire the public
- Balanced approach
- Play a role in prioritizing funding
- Distinguish politics from science
- Define credible science
- Develop credible measures of success or indicators

5. Watershed

- Adopt an entire system approach
- Try to prioritize tributaries
- Identify diverse demands and potential solutions for entire Klamath/Trinity solutions
- Coordinate better with Klamath side
- Increased spawning capabilities on whole system

Captured below are subcommittee volunteers:

Process/Budget Subcommittee volunteers:

1. **Richard Lorenz – Lead**
2. Serge Birk
3. Pat Frost
4. Chuck Schultz
5. Ed Duggan
6. Elizabeth Soderstrom
7. Byron Leydecker
8. Jack Ellwanger (non-TAMWG member)

Socioeconomic Subcommittee volunteers:

1. **Jim Feider– Lead**
2. Dana Hord
3. Jeff Bryant
4. Kevin Lewis
5. David Steinhauer
6. Tim Colvin volunteered by group
7. Zeke Grader volunteered by group
8. Jack Ellwanger (non-TAMWG member)

Watershed Subcommittee volunteers:

1. **Jim Spear volunteered by group – Lead**
2. Ed Duggan
3. Pat Frost
4. Dan Haycox
5. Bill Huber
6. Elizabeth Soderstrom

Science Subcommittee volunteers:

1. **Serge Birk – Lead**
2. Jill Geist
3. Elizabeth Soderstrom
4. Dan Haycox

Implementation Subcommittee volunteers:

1. **Byron Leydecker – Lead**
2. Jeff Bryant
3. Richard Lorenz
4. Jim Feider

Charlie Chamberlain – Need to look into FACA requirements with regards to subcommittees and how their work input feeds back to the federal agencies and be aware there are some guidelines. Subcommittees are generally supposed to develop a product that is reviewed by the TAMWG. Depending on how subcommittee input feeds back to the agencies, you can be subject to the same reporting, public notification, and public participation requirements that the TAMWG is, including publish of meeting notices in the Federal Register. Advise you consult with Mary Ellen Mueller if you have any questions.

Trinity County Grant Program and Tributary Eligibility

Tom Stokely (Trinity County) presentation regarding tributary work

(Attachment 9 – Draft Issue Paper exploring causal link between the Trinity River Division of the CVP and Trinity River Tributaries)

The Bureau of Reclamation has been unwilling to spend money in the South Fork Trinity River based on interpretation of Solicitor's Opinion.

The EIS for 1983 included restoring tributaries and was translated into the 1984 Act PL 98-541. Congress said Interior had an obligation to restore the Trinity Basin including tributaries to pre-dam conditions.

The Mechanical Restoration Alternative of the EIS– No flows, just mechanical. Trinity County added tributary component. Estimated \$2mill a year for tributary work.

Issue paper points link conditions in South fork and TRD. Boat Dance flows for the Hoopa Valley Tribe are necessary because of sediment accumulation in the lower river. There is the issue of hatchery strays into the tributaries and hatchery harvest impacts to wild stocks.

Trinity County would like to see the Trinity River Restoration Program be able to spend money on good projects in the tributaries. Matching funds help a great deal to bring in outside funding. Advise TMC and Secretary of Interior that there are causal linkages.

Wanger's Ruling in December said purpose and need of the EIS/EIR to restore the mainstem was too narrow and that Interior has an obligation to look into tributaries as well as other actions for restoration.

There was some discussion about reimbursable funds and implications of spending CVPIA money in tributaries

Byron Leydecker – Inclusion of the lower Klamath was successful in the 1996 legislation. The Klamath is the estuary of the Trinity. We need to address issues all the way to the ocean and not just above the North Fork.

Tom Stokely – CALFED monies have typically not included the Trinity even though Trinity provides a significant portion of Central Valley's water use/water quality

Recommendation to group is to forward recognition of the causal linkages to the tributaries. Wanger ordered the tributary consideration for the Supplemental EIS.

****Motion** Motion made by Elizabeth Soderstrom to craft language to support tributary work to meet goals of restoration acts:**

“TAMWG believes that a watershed approach should be taken to restore and manage the Trinity River. The TMC should determine that it is appropriate and proper for the Trinity River Restoration Program, through whatever funds are available, to fund appropriate monitoring and restoration work on the Trinity River and all tributary watersheds to contribute to the goals of Public Law 98-541.”

****Second** Seconded by Ed Duggan**

****Motion Passes** No objections- motion passes.**

Water Year 2003 Release Schedule – Continued from yesterday

Douglas Schleusner - News regarding flow optimization letter and initial feedback from some of TMC.

(Attachment 10 – Draft Optimization Letter)

Doug has been able to reach about half of the TMC including its Chair Mike Ryan. The TMC is willing to consider a recommendation at their meeting. The Restoration office is working with Central Valley Project Operations to delay ramp up. There are still more phone calls to be made. Doug's intent is to have his staff make contact with appropriate technical contacts of the TMC agencies. The draft letter recommends careful consideration of optimization but does not forward a specific option. Make this a constructive and not adversarial effort. Suggest that for

Tuesday's TMC meeting, Arnold Whitridge make a presentation to TMC. A technical team will meet to have technical aspects to present to TMC.

****Motion** Ed Duggan made a motion that the chair present the "Flow Optimization" letter from TAMWG and make a verbal presentation to TMC**

****Second** Serge Birk seconded**

****Motion Passed** 11 Members approve the language. Motion passes. Arnold will Present the topic and the letter to TMC at their upcoming meeting.**

Public Comment Period

Presentation by Jill Geist of a Humboldt County letter written to the Secretary of Interior (Attachment 11 – Humboldt County Letter)

Humboldt County wrote a letter dated March 25, 2003 to the Secretary of Interior regarding 50,000 acre-feet of water that is to be released from annually from Trinity Reservoir for Humboldt County and downstream water users. "This is not the same 50,000 acre-feet that Judge Wanger ordered for potential pulse flows." Humboldt County wants the 50,000 acre-feet released for the benefit of fall run Chinook in the lower Klamath and is requesting to receive a letter of support from TAMWG. Other municipal agencies have been and are being approached for support. Ed Duggan – Support has come from Fortuna, Eureka, and possibly Arcata and Trinidad.

Arnold Whitridge – Would it be acceptable to Humboldt County if Interior called the Wanger 50K to meet Humboldt County 50K? Jill Geist – No. This 50K is a separate entitlement.

Tom Stokely – Judge Armstrong's court may order a Klamath solution that would preclude the Trinity 50K. This is contract water. The State Water Board agrees. There is no expiration on the contract because BOR never intended to deliver the water. This water was offered up to "buy" support of Humboldt County for the Trinity River Division of the CVP and then not delivered.

Elizabeth Soderstrom – Two action items: 1-support letter 2-have release schedule to characterize 50K. Have restoration program staff coordinate schedule?

Serge Birk – Justification cited in letter. Prescribed schedule needs to be explicit.

Jill Geist will leave copy of the contract for distribution to members.

**Ed Duggan motion to send letter in support of Humboldt County letter
Bill Huber second**

Serge Birk – Concerned that the trend so far for TAMWG is we receive a presentation on an issue and immediately develop an action. Maybe there are other points of view that we have not heard. How time sensitive is this issue? Byron Leydecker – this has been going on for 40 years and may not be urgent. Jill Geist – Humboldt County is going forward with this.

Arnold Whitridge – If the Secretary of Interior does not respond to Humboldt County, our process committee can lodge protest.

Elizabeth Soderstrom – A prescriptive flow schedule would help make the argument for beneficial use and counter BOR’s argument that the 50k is “in there”.

Richard Lorenz – Suggests we put this on our next agenda and hear more about it then.

Tom Stokely – This is time sensitive. Judge Armstrong will decide Klamath issue soon and the next meeting of TAMWG is June. Fall Chinook come into the river in August. Folks will want to know soon what the flows are going to be. Jill Geist – There is a short-term necessity of dealing with this issue with the Klamath Dry year.

Jill Geist - Perhaps this group would be interested in exploring this issue. Offer the water as a tool to Interior. There is a need to sit down with interior and define/identify this water.

Arnold Whitridge – Access to Secretary is precious and I don’t want to irritate her or send a letter with every issue that comes up. It may be best to deal with this on a regional level and work through an appropriate chain of command.

Possible general focus of letter “We support the exploration of Humboldt County contract water”

Byron Leydecker – Thinks we can do things with much more support than this letter. Central issue is to get Interior to deal with it. Don’t see that letter from TAMWG to Humboldt County would do anything. Arnold Whitridge – Not sure we have authority to send letter to anyone other than Secretary of Interior or Restoration Program parties. Byron Leydecker – The letter should go to the TMC.

Motion has been modified and now is for TAMWG to advise the TMC to facilitate exploration of Humboldt County’s request of Interior regarding their contract water.

Douglas Schleusner – This could be initiated in the public comment period as an informational item. Pre-meeting package that gives members materials to review would have to occur at a later TMC meeting.

Serge Birk – We may need to slow down a little bit to be most effective. Change the focus of the TMC request to make it informational. “This issue is arising and you as TMC should be aware of it.” Recommend they include discussion of it at their next meeting. Again, address pace of addressing issues in general without hearing potential differing points of view. TMC can be advised about the existence of this issue and provide some product with more detail perhaps prepared by Humboldt County later.

Elizabeth Soderstrom - motion to draft letter for review at next TAMWG meeting.

Ed Duggan change motion to make vocal presentation at public comment period of TMC

****Motion** Final Motion now stands that the Chair or other will present to TMC the topic orally and pass along the letter that Humboldt County sent to the Secretary of Interior, ask**

Approved April 22-23 TAMWG meeting minutes.
Recorded by Charlie Chamberlain – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

TMC to include an opportunity for formal presentation later, and draft for TAMWG purposes a letter to review at the next TAMWG meeting.

****Motion passes****

Proposed TAMWG Bylaws

By-laws discussion

Arnold Whitridge – Asked Members to spend some time to review and submit comments on the By-Laws.

(Attachment 12. Draft TAMWG Bylaws)

Kevin Lewis – Suggest putting by-laws as the first agenda item for next meeting.

Question regarding alternates:

Dana Hord – What has been decided regarding alternates? Arnold Whitridge – Mary Ellen Mueller as the designated Federal Representative needs to approve the qualifications of alternates. Alternates need to meet the same criteria as Members.

Next meeting:

With the exception of Jim Feider who cannot make it June 18, everyone can come June 18-19.

There was general agreement that a two-day meeting is needed again with perhaps a half-day on Friday.

Jill Geist – The Klamath Task Force meets sometime in June and may conflict.

The meeting will be June 19-20 in Weaverville

The next meeting will mostly be dedicated to budget. Put both public presentations (McBain and Haukey) on agenda, bylaws, rush creek delta presentation that was postponed from this meeting for Jim Spear's benefit, the Humboldt County letter, and an Executive Director's report.

Adjourn 2:05

Summary of all actions items and motions passed:

Approval of minutes from February meeting

Byron Leydecker made and Serge Birk seconded a motion to approve the February minutes. Motion passed.

Gold Bar Proposal

Elizabeth Soderstrom made and Richard Lorenz seconded a motion to put discussion of the Gold Bar proposal on the next meeting agenda. Solicit presentations on detail of BLM involvement, who will manage the property, and discussion of the temporary bridge that may be needed to transport gravel from the site. The motion passed. Issue will be discussed at the next TAMWG meeting

Salt Flat Bridge

Pat Frost made and Byron Leydecker seconded a motion to include discussion of the Salt Flat Bridge and public access issue on the next agenda. Motion passed. Topic will be incorporated into next meeting's agenda.

Flow Optimization Letter

Jim Feider made and Ed Duggan seconded a motion to suggest that dry-year allocation of water be optimized considering current wet year conditions and for TAMWG to make the recommendation directly to TMC. Motion passed. Arnold Whitridge will draft a letter for review during tomorrow's session.

Tributary Restoration

Elizabeth Soderstrom made and Ed Duggan seconded a motion to craft language to support tributary work to meet goals of restoration acts: "TAMWG believes that a watershed approach should be taken to restore and manage the Trinity River. The TMC should determine that it is appropriate and proper for the Trinity River Restoration Program, through whatever funds are available, to fund appropriate monitoring and restoration work on the Trinity River and all tributary watersheds to contribute to the goals of Public Law 98-541." Motion passed.

Flow Optimization Letter and Presentation to TMC

Ed Duggan made and Serge Birk seconded a motion that the chair present the "Flow Optimization" letter from TAMWG and make a verbal presentation to TMC. Eleven Members approved and the motion passed.

Humboldt County Letter

Ed Duggan made and Bill Huber seconded a motion for the Chair or other Member to make an oral presentation to the TMC and pass along the letter that Humboldt County sent to the Secretary of Interior, ask TMC to include an opportunity for formal presentation later, and draft for TAMWG purposes, a letter to review at the next TAMWG meeting. Motion passed.

The Following Subcommittees were formed:

Process/Budget Subcommittee:

- 1. Richard Lorenz – Lead**
2. Serge Birk
3. Pat Frost
4. Chuck Schultz
5. Ed Duggan
6. Elizabeth Soderstrom
7. Byron Leydecker
8. Jack Ellwanger (non-TAMWG member)

Socioeconomic Subcommittee:

- 1. Jim Feider– Lead**
2. Dana Hord
3. Jeff Bryant
4. Kevin Lewis
5. David Steinhauser
6. Tim Colvin volunteered by group
7. Zeke Grader volunteered by group
8. Jack Ellwanger (non-TAMWG member)

Watershed Subcommittee:

- 1. Jim Spear volunteered by group – Lead**
2. Ed Duggan
3. Pat Frost
4. Dan Haycox
5. Bill Huber
6. Elizabeth Soderstrom

Science Subcommittee:

- 1. Serge Birk – Lead**
2. Jill Geist
3. Elizabeth Soderstrom
4. Dan Haycox

Implementation Subcommittee volunteers:

- 1. Byron Leydecker – Lead**
2. Jeff Bryant
3. Richard Lorenz
4. Jim Feider

Attachments *(the attachments listed below will be made part of the final package of meeting records for the meeting):*

- 1. Final Agenda**
 - Agenda approved by TAMWG for the April 22-23, 2003 meeting
- 2. Gold Bar Proposal**
 - Proposal from Scott McBain. Asks TAMWG to support BLM acquisition of property on Gold Bar for long-term Restoration Program sediment supply
- 3. Strategic Plan PowerPoint Presentation**
 - Presentation by Doug Schleusner
- 4. Draft Strategic Plan**
 - Draft Strategic plan for the Trinity River Restoration Program
- 5. Adaptive Management PowerPoint Presentation**
 - Presentation by Daryl Peterson
- 6. ROD Dry Year Flows and Potential Fall Pulse Flows PowerPoint Presentation**
 - Presentation by Charlie Chamberlain
- 7. Averting Another Die-Off**
 - Paper prepared by Department of Interior for Federal Judge proposing potential solutions to avert an adult salmonid die-off of Trinity River fish in the lower Klamath
- 8. Executive Director's Quarterly Report**
 - Quarterly report from Doug Schleusner
- 9. Draft Issue Paper exploring causal link between the Trinity River Division of the CVP and Trinity River Tributaries**
 - White-paper prepared by Tom Stokely
- 10. Flow Optimization Letter**
 - Letter from TAMWG to TMC regarding optimization of the Dry year water allocation in light of contemporary hydrologic conditions
- 11. Humboldt County Letter**
 - Letter from Humboldt County to the Secretary of Interior regarding Klamath River Fishery Water Supply